

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

THOMAS SKÖLD,
Plaintiff,

v.

GALDERMA LABORATORIES, L.P.;
GALDERMA LABORATORIES, INC.;
and GALDERMA S.A.,
Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 14-5280

ORDER

AND NOW, this 20th day of March, 2015, upon consideration of Defendants Galderma Laboratories, L.P. and Galderma Laboratories, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Stay Pending the Outcome of the Administrative Proceeding [ECF No. 22]; Plaintiff Thomas Sköld's Response in Opposition thereto [ECF No. 29]; and Galderma L.P. and Galderma Inc.'s Reply [ECF No. 33], as well as Defendant Galderma S.A.'s Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Stay Pending the Outcome of the Administrative Proceeding [ECF No. 36]; the Plaintiff's Response in Opposition thereto [ECF No. 38]; and Galderma S.A.'s Reply [ECF No. 46], after oral argument on March 19, 2015, and for the reasons provided in the Court's opinion of March 20, 2015 [ECF No. 50], **IT IS ORDERED** that:

- (1) Defendant Galderma S.A.'s motion to dismiss the breach of contract claim in Count Five is **GRANTED**; Count Five of the Complaint shall be **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** as to Defendant Galderma S.A.;
- (2) Defendants' Galderma Laboratories, Inc.'s motion to dismiss the unjust enrichment claim in Count Six is **GRANTED**; Count Six of the Complaint shall be **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** as to Defendant Galderma Laboratories, Inc.;

- (3) Defendants' motions to dismiss the unfair competition claim in Court Four are **DEFERRED**; the parties shall refer to the Court's instructions regarding supplemental briefing in its Order dated March 17, 2015 [ECF No. 48];
- (4) Defendants' motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim are otherwise **DENIED**;
- (5) Defendants' motions to stay are **DENIED AS MOOT**; and
- (6) Defendant Galderma S.A.'s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction is **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:

/S/WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.

WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.